



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. 08/903,743	FILING DATE 07/31/97	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR LONG	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 169.0568
-------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------

005514 -TM21/0119  
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK NY 10112

EXAMINER PAULA, C
----------------------

ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER 12
------------------	--------------------

DATE MAILED: 01/19/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

08/903,743

Applicant(s)

LONG ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2176

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 December 2000 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check only a) or b)]


- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 8 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 707.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 12 October 2000. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

4. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_
5. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
7. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-38.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_
9. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ a) ☐ has b) ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
11. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
**STEPHEN S. HONG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Continuation of 6. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner disagrees with the Applicants' statement regarding claim 1, that: "neither the Judson patent, nor the Yoda patent discloses or suggests the concept of formatting a list of hypertext documents..." (p.12, pgph.3). Yoda discloses the formatting of a list of HTML documents by assigning page numbers, printing every one of these documents in their proper order (along with linked documents), and inhibiting the same information from being printed more than once (c.3, L.14-34). Judson teaches the compiling of the HTML documents pages based upon the access history of certain kind of HTML documents having document structure (c.7,L.10-57), as claimed by the Applicants in claim 1, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined these two references, because Yoda teaches printing hypermedia document in an understandable format (c.2,L.50-51).

Moreover, the Applicants indicate concerning Judson's abstract that it: "offers no suggestion of, forming a printable document from multiple hypertext documents as those documents are accessed" (p.13, pgph.2). The Examiner disagrees with this statement, because although Judson fails to explicitly disclose performing the steps in claim 1 while the user accesses the document, Judson includes a motivation for performing these steps in order to allow a user to viewing and printing the documents without the download being complete (c.7,L.43-57, c.9,L.36-52).

Moreover, the Applicants indicate concerning the Yoda Patent that it: "relates two documents without formatting a list of hyper-text documents" (p.13, pgph.3). The Examiner disagrees with this statement, because in this instance Yoda teaches formatting a list of HTML documents(such as those taught by Judson) for printing, as has been claimed by the Applicants.

In addition, the Applicants submit regarding claims 16, 27-29, 31, and 38, that: " the Judson and Yoda patents do not disclose or suggest a method of forming a printable document by collating a plurality of hyper-text documents..." (p.15, pgph.2). The Examiner disagrees with this statement, because as the Examiner already pointed out in the previous Office Action(P.9), Yoda teaches the formation of a printable document by collating the hypertext documents so as to print, and present these documents in an easy-to-understand format.

Further, the Applicants submit, regarding claim 29, that: "Judson and Yoda do not disclose or suggest means for monitoring access to documents via a resource locator ..." (p.15, pgph.3). The Examiner disagrees with this statement, because as the Examiner already pointed out in the previous Office Action(P.10), this claim is directed towards claim 16, where Yoda teaches the formation of a list printable document by collating the hypertext documents so as to print, and present these documents in an easy-to-understand format.

Further, the Applicants submit, regarding claim 31, that: "Judson and Yoda do not disclose or suggest a computer readable medium including instruction modules comprising a collating module for collating selected ones of documents from a compiled list ..." (p.16, pgph.2). The Examiner disagrees with this statement, because as the Examiner already pointed out in the previous Office Action(P.10), this claim is directed towards the method of claim 1, where Yoda teaches the formation of a list printable documents by collating the hypertext documents so as to print, and present these documents in an easy-to-understand format.

Furthermore, the Applicants submit, regarding claim 38, that: "Judson and Yoda do not disclose or suggest a computer implemented program for forming a single printable document ..." (p.16, pgph.4). The Examiner disagrees with this statement, because as the Examiner already pointed out in the previous Office Action(P.11), this claim is directed towards claim 16, where Yoda teaches the formation of a list printable documents by collating the hypertext documents so as to present these documents as a single document in an easy-to-understand format.